

THE HONORABLE ROBERT S. LASNIK

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

TORREY GRAGG, on his own behalf and on
behalf of similarly situated persons,

Plaintiff,

v.

ORANGE CAB COMPANY, INC., a
Washington corporation; and RIDECHARGE,
INC., a Delaware corporation d/b/a TAXI
MAGIC,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:12-cv-00576-RSL

STIPULATION AND
[PROPOSED] ORDER
(1) GRANTING PLAINTIFF
LEAVE TO FILE FIRST
AMENDED COMPLAINT AND
(2) EXTENDING DEADLINE FOR
ORANGE CAB AND
RIDECHARGE TO ANSWER OR
OTHERWISE RESPOND TO
PLAINTIFF'S FIRST AMENDED
COMPLAINT

STIPULATION

Plaintiff requests leave to file a First Amended Complaint to plead claims under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)(2), Defendants have agreed herein to provide written consent for Plaintiff to file his First Amended Complaint attached at Exhibit A. In conjunction with the filing of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint, the parties, by and through their attorneys of record, respectfully request that the Court enter the proposed Order set forth below, which extends the deadline for Defendants Orange Cab Company, Inc. ("Orange Cab") and Ridecharge, Inc. ("Ridecharge") to answer or otherwise respond to Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint, until July 20, 2012.

STIPULATION REGARDING AMENDED COMPLAINT
AND RESPONSE DEADLINE
(No. 2:12-cv-00576-RSL) — 1

HEYRICH KALISH MCGUIGAN PLLC
1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 540
Seattle, Washington 98101
(206) 838-2504

1 Stipulated and respectfully submitted this 29th day of June, 2012, by:

2 DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
3 Attorneys for Defendants

4 By: s/ Ryan C. Gist
Kenneth E. Payson, WSBA #26369
5 Ryan C. Gist, WSBA #41816
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 2200
6 Seattle, Washington 98101-3045
Telephone: (206) 622-3150
7 Fax: (206) 757-7700
E-mail: kenpayson@dwt.com
8 ryangist@dwt.com

9
10 HEYRICH KALISH MCGUIGAN PLLC
Counsel for Plaintiff

11 By: s/ Donald W. Heyrich
Donald W. Heyrich, WSBA #23091
12 1325 Fourth Ave, Suite 540
Seattle, Washington 98101
13 Telephone: (206) 838-2504
Fax: (206) 826-5378
14 E-mail: dheyrich@hkm.com

15 KIRBY LAW GROUP
Albert H. Kirby, WSBA #23091
16 93 S. Jackson St. #63230
Seattle, Washington 98104
17 Telephone: (206) 414-9950
Fax: (866) 845-6302
18 E-mail: ahkirby@kirby-legal.com

ORDER

Having reviewed the foregoing stipulation of the parties, plaintiff is granted leave to file Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint. Defendants Orange Cab Company, Inc. ("Orange Cab") and Ridecharge, Inc. ("Ridecharge") are granted until July 20, 2012, to answer or otherwise respond to Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this ____ day of _____, 2012.

ROBERT S. LASNIK
United States District Judge

Presented by:

HEYRICH KALISH MCGUIGAN PLLC
Counsel for Plaintiff

By: s/ Donald W. Heyrich

Donald W. Heyrich, WSBA #23091
1325 Fourth Ave, Suite 540
Seattle, Washington 98101
Telephone: (206) 838-2504
Fax: (206) 826-5378
E-mail: dheyrich@hkm.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on June 29, 2012, I caused a copy of the foregoing document to be served on plaintiff's counsel via the Court's ECF filing system:

Kenneth E. Payson, WSBA #26369
Ryan C. Gist, WSBA #41816
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 2200
Seattle, Washington 98101-3045
Telephone: (206) 622-3150
Fax: (206) 757-7700
E-mail: kenpayson@dwt.com
ryangist@dwt.com

DATED this 29th day of June, 2012.

HEYRICH KALISH MCGUIGAN PLLC
Counsel for Plaintiff

By: s/ Donald W. Heyrich
Donald W. Heyrich, WSBA #23091
1325 Fourth Ave, Suite 540
Seattle, Washington 98101
Telephone: (206) 838-2504
Fax: (206) 826-5378
E-mail: dheyrich@hkm.com

EXHIBIT A

THE HONORABLE ROBERT S. LASNIK

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

TORREY GRAGG, on his own behalf and
on behalf of other similarly situated persons,

Plaintiff,

v.

ORANGE CAB COMPANY, INC., a
Washington corporation; and RIDECHARGE,
INC., a Delaware Corporation, doing business
as TAXI MAGIC,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:12-cv-00576-RSL

**PLAINTIFF'S [PROPOSED] FIRST
AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR
DAMAGES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Plaintiff TORREY GRAGG ("Representative Plaintiff"), on his own behalf and on behalf of all other similarly situated persons (collectively "Plaintiffs"), by and through their counsel, bring the following Complaint against Defendants ORANGE CAB COMPANY, INC. and RIDECHARGE, INC., doing business as TAXI MAGIC, to obtain from each of them all damages, injunctive relief, attorneys' fees, costs, and other remedies Plaintiffs are entitled to recover under Washington law and equity.

I. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. Defendants contend that federal jurisdiction exists for the claims asserted against them by Plaintiffs.

2. Representative Plaintiff is a resident of King County in Washington State.

3. Many of the wrongful acts and omissions referenced in this complaint occurred,

1 were initiated, were furthered, or were given assistance in King County and Washington State.
2 Defendants do business in King County and Washington State.

3 **II. PARTIES**

4 4. Plaintiff TORREY GRAGG is an individual domiciled and residing in King
5 County, Washington.

6 5. Defendant ORANGE CAB COMPANY, INC. is a corporation organized and
7 operating under the laws of the State of Washington.

8 6. Defendant RIDECHARGE, INC. identifies itself as an organization organized and
9 operating under the laws of the State of Delaware. Ridecharge, Inc. conducts a substantial
10 amount of business in King County, Washington.

11 7. Defendants, and each of them, directly or else through other persons acting on
12 their behalf, conspired to, agreed to, contributed to, assisted with, and/or otherwise caused all of
13 the wrongful acts and omissions which are the subject matter of this complaint. But for the
14 conduct of each of the Defendants, none of the wrongful acts and injuries alleged herein would
15 have occurred.

16 **III. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

17 8. Defendants have joined together by agreement or otherwise to accomplish the
18 business of designing, developing, supporting, marketing, and distributing an application ("app")
19 for smart cellular telephones that enables users to use their cellular telephones to arrange
20 transportation by taxi cab.

21 9. This app, known as "Taxi Magic," is directly integrated into taxi dispatch
22 systems. Purportedly, users can find taxis based on location, book taxis, track the arrival of a cab
23 through automatic updates and a map view, and charge the ride to a credit card all through the
24 app.

25 10. Defendants are responsible for causing and otherwise assisting with a marketing
26 campaign that has relied upon the transmission of unsolicited text messages to advertise Taxi
27

1 Magic to cellular telephone subscribers in Washington State and elsewhere.

2 11. Mr. Gragg maintains cellular service with a common cellular telephone provider
3 and maintains a cellular telephone number and has done so for a period of time, including all
4 times relevant to this complaint.

5 12. Consumers like Mr. Gragg have no effective means to avoid the receipt of
6 unsolicited text messages. Receipt of each such text message invariably causes consumers to lose
7 some of the finite storage capacity of the cellular telephones until they examine the text message,
8 review it sufficiently to determine that it is not an invited text message, and then take affirmative
9 steps to delete such unsolicited text messages.

10 13. Mr. Gragg did not provide this cellular telephone number to Defendants or their
11 agents for the purpose of receiving marketing messages via text message or any other telephonic
12 communication. Nor did Mr. Gragg provide authorization or consent to Defendants or their
13 agents to send him a text message or to store his personal contact information for purposes of
14 marketing or distributing the Taxi Magic app by text message.

15 14. On or about February 26, 2012, Defendants and/or their agents initiated or
16 otherwise assisted in the transmission of an unsolicited text message to Mr. Gragg in Washington
17 State through his cellular telephone number, and Mr. Gragg received this text message. The
18 unsolicited text message stated, "***Smart Phone? Book our cabs with Taxi Magic - #1 FREE***
19 ***taxi booking app,***" and provided a link to download the Taxi Magic app. The unsolicited text
20 message was made to appear as though it originated from telephone number (571) 309-5286. On
21 information and belief, that is a telephone number controlled by Defendants and operated for a
22 commercial purpose. The unsolicited text message sent to Mr. Gragg's cellular telephone was a
23 commercial solicitation attempting to get him to download the Taxi Magic app for the
24 commercial benefit of Defendants. Mr. Gragg received this text message. Defendants sent the
25 unsolicited text message by means of an automated telephone dialing system ("ATDS").
26 Defendants could not have engaged in their text message marketing campaign without using an
27

1 ATDS.

2 15. Like other similarly situated persons, Mr. Gragg was injured as a result of
3 Defendants' actions above, in ways including, but not limited to: (a) Incurring cellular phone
4 charges and/or reduction in cellular phone time or data capacity to receive the unsolicited text
5 message from Defendants; (b) Invasion of privacy; (c) Aggravation and annoyance from having
6 to retrieve or administer the unsolicited messages; and (d) Loss of use of the full capacities and
7 capabilities, e.g., electronic storage space, of his cellular telephone.

8 16. By the conduct detailed above, Defendants, directly and/or through its authorized
9 agents, engage in unlawful and otherwise wrongful marketing and advertising practices. These
10 practices have damaged Representative Plaintiff Mr. Gragg and persons similarly situated.
11 Defendants caused the transmission of unsolicited electronic commercial text messages to
12 telephone numbers assigned to Representative Plaintiff and other residents of Washington State
13 for cellular or pager services equipped to receive such messages.

14 17. Defendants' conduct above negatively affects the public interest. Defendants
15 caused the unsolicited transmission of numerous SMS text messages to numerous consumers
16 throughout the United States and its territories, including Washington State.

17 IV. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

18 18. Representative Plaintiff brings this class action on behalf of himself and as a
19 representative of the following class of persons (the "National Class") entitled to remedies under
20 federal law including, but not limited to, damages:

21 All persons in the United States of America and its territories who
22 were sent, to their cellular telephone numbers, at least one
23 unsolicited text message by a Defendant, or someone acting on
24 behalf of a Defendant.

25 19. Representative Plaintiff also brings this class action on behalf of himself and as a
26 representative of the following persons (the "Washington Subclass") who are entitled to
27 remedies under Washington State law including, but not limited to, damages:

All persons in Washington State who were sent, to their cellular

1 telephone numbers, at least one unsolicited text message by a
2 Defendant, or someone acting on behalf of a Defendant.

3 20. Plaintiffs' class claims satisfy all of the requirements for class action certification
4 pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a) and 23(b)(1), 23(b)(2), and 23(b)(3).

5 21. Satisfying all requisite numerosity requirements, numerous consumers in
6 Washington State and numerous consumers through the United States and its territories are
7 believed to be members of this class. Joinder of so many class members in to a single action is
8 impracticable. In fact, given the number of class members, the only way to deliver substantial
9 justice to all members of the class is by means of a single class action.

10 22. There are questions of fact and law common to the class, which predominate over
11 any questions affecting only individual members. The questions of law and fact common to the
12 class arising from Defendants' conduct include, without limitation, the following:

13 a. Whether Defendants negligently, willfully, and/or knowingly caused
14 violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, when sending
15 unsolicited text messages to Representative Plaintiff and the National Class?

16 b. Whether Defendants negligently, willfully, and/or knowingly caused
17 violations, including *per se* violations, of the Washington Consumer Protection Act,
18 RCW 19.86.10, *et seq.*, when sending unsolicited text messages to Representative
19 Plaintiff and the Washington Subclass?

20 c. What are the statutory damages that the Defendants must pay for each of
21 the unsolicited text messages that the Defendants caused to be sent to the Plaintiffs?

22 d. Whether Defendants used an ATDS?

23 e. Whether the transmission of text messages on behalf of Defendants was
24 commercial in nature under RCW 19.190.060?

25 f. Whether any Defendants are vicariously or otherwise liable for their
26 agents or assigns or other Defendants sending unsolicited text messages to Plaintiffs?

27 23. The questions set forth above predominate over any questions affecting only

1 individual persons, and a class action is superior with respect to considerations of consistency,
2 economy, efficiency, fairness and equity, to other available methods for the fair and efficient
3 adjudication of Plaintiffs' claims.

4 24. Representative Plaintiff's claims are typical of those of the class in that he, just
5 like the other members of the class, was the victim of the unlawful marketing practices
6 referenced in this complaint. The SMS text message which Representative Plaintiff received is
7 typical of the SMS text messages which were transmitted to other members of the class.

8 25. A class action is the appropriate method for the fair and efficient adjudication of
9 this controversy. Defendants have acted in a general manner to the damage of the class. The
10 presentation of separate actions by individual class members could create a risk of inconsistent
11 and varying adjudications, establish incompatible standards of conduct for Defendants, and/or
12 substantially impair or impede the ability of class members to protect their interests. Moreover,
13 the individual damages of each of the Plaintiffs are so low that it would be economically
14 impracticable for putative class members to bring their claims individually.

15 26. A primary factor in Plaintiff's bringing this case is for final injunctive relief
16 which is necessary and appropriate to ensure that Defendants cease and desist their unlawful and
17 wrongful conduct. A class action is the most efficient means to ensure that Defendants' do not
18 damage the class in the future.

19 27. Representative Plaintiff is an adequate representative of the class because he is a
20 member of the class and his interests do not conflict with the interests of the members of the
21 class he seeks to represent. The interests of the members of the class will be fairly and
22 adequately protected by Representative Plaintiff. Also, Representative Plaintiff is represented by
23 a team of attorneys who together have extensive, multi-jurisdictional experience representing
24 clients in complex class action litigation.

25 28. Maintenance of this action as a class action is a fair and efficient method for the
26 adjudication of this controversy. It would be impractical and undesirable for each member of the
27

1 class who suffered harm to bring a separate action. In addition, the maintenance of separate
 2 actions would place a substantial and unnecessary burden on the courts and could result in
 3 inconsistent adjudications, while a single class action can determine, with judicial economy, the
 4 rights of all class members.

5 29. If this action is not certified as a class action, then given the number of class
 6 members, the only way that the court system will not be overburdened by a multiplicity of suits
 7 over the subject matter of this complaint is if members of the class cannot or do not pursue an
 8 action against Defendants for reasons altogether unrelated to the merits of their claims (*e.g.*,
 9 challenges in accessing legal counsel, the mundane realities of surviving in a challenging
 10 economy, *et cetera*). Most Plaintiffs can obtain legal representation for their claims only through
 11 a class action. The only practical way to ensure that all members of the class are afforded an
 12 opportunity to obtain substantial justice with regard to the wrongs and injuries inflicted upon
 13 them by Defendants is to resolve the subject matter of this complaint through a class action.

14 **V. FIRST COUNT**

15 **Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act** 16 (*Representative Plaintiff and the National Class vs. Defendants*)

17 30. Plaintiffs reassert and re-allege the allegations set forth in the above paragraphs as
 18 if the same were alleged herein this count.

19 31. At all times material herein, Plaintiffs have been entitled to the rights, protections,
 20 and benefits provided under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227.

21 32. Negligently, recklessly, willfully, and/or intentionally, Defendants directly and/or
 22 vicariously engaged in acts, omissions, and/or other conduct as referenced herein this complaint
 23 that violates the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. Defendants directly and/or vicariously
 24 created, designed, deployed, and otherwise used an ATDS which initiated numerous telephone
 25 calls to Plaintiffs' cellular telephone numbers. These telephone calls transmitted unsolicited
 26 commercial text messages to the cellular telephones of Representative Plaintiff and the other
 27 Plaintiffs as referenced in this complaint.

33. Plaintiffs are entitled to recover \$500 in damages from the Defendants for each violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act.

34. Additionally, Plaintiffs are entitled to all damages referenced herein and in accord with proof, attorneys' fees, costs, treble damages, and other remedies allowed by the Telephone Consumer Protection Act or else otherwise permitted by law.

35. The Defendants continue their unlawful conduct and will continue such conduct in the future absent (a) a judicial declaration which clearly states the illegality of their conduct and (b) an injunction barring the Defendants from engaging in such illegal conduct in the future.

VI. SECOND COUNT
Violations of the Washington Consumer Protection Act
(Representative Plaintiff and the Washington Subclass vs. Defendants)

36. Plaintiffs reassert and re-allege the allegations set forth in the above paragraphs.

37. At all times material herein, Plaintiffs have been entitled to the rights, protections, and benefits provided under the Washington Consumer Protection Act and related Washington statutes.

38. Defendants' practice of transmitting and/or assisting in the transmission of electronic commercial text messages to Plaintiffs' cellular phones is a violation of RCW 19.190.060. This violation, per statute, is a *per se* violation of Washington's Consumer Protection Act, RCW 19.86.010, *et seq.*

39. Defendants' practice of transmitting and/or assisting in the transmission of electronic commercial text messages to Plaintiffs' cellular phones is conduct that vitally affects the public interest and is an unfair or deceptive act in trade or commerce and an unfair method of competition for the purpose of applying the Consumer Protection Act, RCW 19.86.010, *et seq.*

40. Defendants conducted these practices in the scope of their trade and in furtherance of the development and preservation of such business services.

41. Defendants' violations of the Consumer Protection Act are intentional, willful, and subject to treble damages under RCW 19.86.010, *et seq.*

1 who are not customers of Defendants.

2 C. Order Defendants to make Representative Plaintiff and the other class members
3 whole by providing compensation for past and future pecuniary losses resulting from the
4 unlawful practices described in the above paragraphs in amounts to be determined at trial, but in
5 no event less than \$500.00 per violation of RCW 19.86.010, *et seq.*, RCW 19.190.010, *et seq.*,
6 and 47 U.S.C. § 227.

7 D. Order Defendants to make Representative Plaintiff and the other class members
8 whole by providing compensation for past and future non-pecuniary losses resulting from the
9 unlawful practices described in the above paragraphs, in amounts to be determined at trial.

10 E. Order Defendants to make Representative Plaintiff and the other class members
11 whole by providing appropriate prejudgment interest, in an amount to be determined at trial, and
12 other affirmative relief necessary to eradicate the effects of its unlawful practices.

13 F. Order Defendants to pay Representative Plaintiffs and the other class members
14 punitive and/or treble damages to the fullest extent allowed by law, including but not limited to
15 all punitive and/or treble damages for a knowing or willful violation of the Telephone Consumer
16 Protection Act and the Washington Consumer Protection Act.

17 G. Award Representative Plaintiff and the other class members the costs of this
18 action, including attorneys' fees, as authorized by law, the Washington Consumer Protection
19 Act, and/or as sounds in tort, contract, or equity.

20 H. Grant any additional or further relief as provided by law or equity which this
21 Court finds appropriate, equitable, or just.

22 **VIII. JURY DEMAND**

23 Representative Plaintiff demands a jury trial on all issues so triable.
24
25
26
27

1 Dated: June xx, 2012.

2
3 **HEYRICH KALISH MCGUIGAN PLLC**
4 1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 540
5 Seattle, WA 98101
6 Tel: (206) 838-2504
7 Fax: (206) 826-5378

8 *s/ Donald W. Heyrich*
9 Donald W. Heyrich, WSBA #23091
10 *dheyrich@hkm.com*

KIRBY LAW GROUP
93 S. Jackson St. #63230
Seattle, WA 98104-2818
Tel: (206) 414-9950
Fax: (866) 845-6302

Albert H. Kirby, WSBA #40187
ahkirby@kirby-legal.com

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

DECLARATION OF SERVICE

I, the undersigned, certify that, on this date, a true copy of the foregoing document will be or has been served on the persons listed below in the manner shown:

Kenneth E. Payson, WSBA #26369
kenpayson@dwt.com
Ryan C. Gist, WSBA #41816
ryangist@dwt.com

☐ Legal Messenger
☐ Facsimile
☐ United States Mail, First Class
☐ Direct Email
☒ CM/ECF Notification

Davis Wright Tremaine LLP
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 2200
Seattle, WA 98101-3045
Telephone: 206-622-3150
Fax: 206-757-7700

Dated: June xxxx, 2012

/s/ Donald W. Heyrich, WSBA #23091